

**REMARKS**

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 - 13 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 - 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,595. The examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by LONEGRO et al. The examiner has rejected claims 7 - 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over LONEGRO et al. in view of FITZGERALD, Jr. et al. In view of the following remarks and the terminal disclaimer being filed concurrently with the present response, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been rendered moot and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 6 - 13, and provide an indication of the allowability of all the pending claims.

Applicants are filing the attached terminal disclaimer merely to remove any issue as to whether the claims of the above-identified application and those of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,595 in any way conflict. However, neither applicants nor the assignee intend to make any representation as to whether the invention defined by any of the claims of the above-identified application would have been obvious in view of any other pending application or issued patent or whether any obviousness-type double patenting rejection would be appropriate if the enclosed terminal disclaimer were not filed. Accordingly, the terminal disclaimer is being filed only to expedite the allowance of the pending claims.

With the present Reply, the independent claims have been amended to emphasize

P20688.A07

that repositioning of dimensions occurs in response to a user *dragging* the dimension to a desired position. LONEGRO et al. do not discuss or suggest repositioning of a dimension by dragging. FITZGERALD, Jr. et al. do not supply the deficiencies of LONEGRO et al. Thus, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the independent claims.

The dependent claims are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

P20688.A07

Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Edward SCHWALB et al.

June 16, 2004  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

William E. Lytle Reg. No. 41,568  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027